

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-31 remain pending. Claims 1, 9, and 15 are independent.

FORM 1449 ACKNOWLEDGMENT REQUESTED

It is noted that Applicant has not yet received initialed copies of the PTO-1449 (submitted on February 21 and February 28, 2006) for the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that such forms be provided.

§ 102 REJECTION - TERADA

Claims 1-6, 9-13, 15-23, 25-26, 28-29, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being unpatentable over Terada et al. (USP 6,167,046). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Independent claim 1 recites, in part "a master device ... comprising ... a microprocessor operatively connected to the at least one slave device for repeatedly sending a status request signal to the at least one slave device and receiving one or more response signals from the at least one slave device." The Examiner alleges that col. 2, lines 16-44 of Terada disclose the above recited feature.

Contrary to the Examiner's allegation, Terada cannot be relied upon to teach or suggest the above recited feature. Terada is directed toward a communication method, a communication system and a computer readable recording medium recording a communication program for a communication network. Col. 2, lines 16-44 merely indicate that in a communication network that includes a plurality of equipment communicating with each other, the communication is accomplished by transmitting, receiving and processing communication packets. Each of the plurality equipments may have a communication unit to implement the communication function. There is nothing in the relied upon portion that teaches or suggests a microprocessor that repeatedly sends a status request signal to a slave device. Indeed, Terada actually teaches a way from the recited feature by stating that a packet is transmitted to each of the plurality equipments in response to the received external request. *See col. 3, lines 4-6.* This alone is sufficient to distinguish claim 1 from Terada.

Moreover, Terada also cannot be relied upon to teach or suggest the feature of "a memory coupled to the microprocessor for constructing an operation history database by cumulatively storing operation status data of the at least one slave device included in each response signal, wherein the microprocessor extracts data from the operation history database when a history inquiry request is received from a user." In other words, the operation history

database cumulatively stores operation status data included in each response signal in response to the repeatedly sent status request signal.

In contrast, Terada discloses that in CONTENTS storage (12), the CONTENTS data held by the electrical equipment is stored in advance (see col. 13, lines 12-13) and the communication control unit (38) includes a recording medium and stores on the recording medium in advance a plurality pieces of the function information. In other words, there is no disclosure of constructing the operation history database by cumulatively storing operation status data.

It is further noted that as claimed, the master device includes the microprocessor and the memory with the operation history database. This is contrasted with Terada in which each equipment has a CONTENTS storage for itself. For at least the above stated reasons, independent claim 1 is distinguishable over Terada.

Independent claim 9 recites, in part “microprocessor coupled to the plurality of slave devices for repeatedly sending status request signals to the plurality of slave devices and receiving one or more response signals from each of the plurality of slave devices” and “a memory coupled to the microprocessor for constructing an operation history database by cumulatively storing operation status data of the plurality of slave devices included in each response signal, wherein the microprocessor extracts data from the operation history database when a history inquiry request is received from a user.” It is

demonstrated above that Terada cannot teach or suggest these features. Accordingly, claim 9 is distinguishable over Terada.

Independent claim 15 recites, in part “repeatedly sending status request signals to a plurality of slave devices”, “receiving one or more response signals sent by each slave device in response to the status request signals”, “constructing an operation history database in a memory by cumulatively storing operation status data of the plurality of slave devices included in each response signal into the memory”, and “extracting data from the operation history database when a history inquiry request is received from a user.” It is demonstrated above that Terada cannot teach or suggest these features. Therefore, claim 15 is distinguishable over Terada.

Claims 2-6, 10-13, 16-23, 25-26, 28-29 and 31 depend from independent claims 1, 9 or 15 directly or indirectly. Accordingly, these dependent claims are distinguishable over Terada.

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 1-6, 9-13, 15-23, 25-26, 28-29 and 31 based on Terada be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTION – TERADA, KLOSTERMAN

Claims 7, 14 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Terada in view of Klosterman et al. (USP Pub. 2002/0092017). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 7, 14 and 27 depend from independent claims 1, 9 and 15, respectively. It is demonstrated above that the independent claims are all distinguishable over Terada. Klosterman is not relied upon to correct for at least the above noted deficiencies of Terada. Therefore, independent claims are also distinguishable over the combination of Terada and Klosterman. Accordingly, claims 7, 14 and 27 are also distinguishable over the same references.

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 7, 14 and 27 based on Terada and Klosterman be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Hyung Sohn (Reg. No. 44,346), to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

U.S. Application No. 10/777,655

0465-1148P

Art Unit: 2151

Page 7 of 7

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH &, BIRCH, LLP

By: Esther H. Chong
Esther H. Chong
Reg. No. 40,953
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

HNS
EHC/HNS/vd
0465-1148P